''Sticking It to Working Families,'' which is exactly what the All American Tax Relief Act, which was just past in this House, has done.

Why do I say that? That is because what both the White House and the Republican House leadership refused to do was to reduce the income threshold for the child tax credit to $10,000. That level has gone up to $11,000. It means that people who are making $10,000 a year will no longer be eligible for a child tax credit. That is 4.3 million families. It is 9 million children who will be denied the child tax credit. These are working families.

The House Republican leadership has said this is a welfare program. That is the kind of disdain that they show for working families.

What is going to happen to these families is their taxes, yes, are going to increase, all under the guise of an All American Tax Relief Act. It is wrong. These families, these children, deserve better. That is what this House should be about.

HELPING AMERICAN FAMILIES

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats' Partnership for a New America is a lot about helping American families. There is no better way to help working American families than to support them as they struggle to balance work and family life, because workers need help addressing how to be both a good parent and a good employee, how to give their family the time they need without compromising their job or their career.

The Partnership with America will improve the lives of working families by encouraging debate on legislation like the Balancing Act. This Balancing Act will provide paid family leave for new parents, improve the quality and availability of child care, in-school nutrition programs, after school assistance, fund voluntary universal preschool and assist employers in establishing a family-friendly workplace.

I urge my colleagues to join me in addressing the needs of all families, thus having a true partnership with Americans.

NEED TO WORK IN A BIPARTISAN MANNER

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what a better day it would be if we could work in a bipartisan manner. We just debated a tax bill that could have been made much better for our constituents across this Nation.

I believe in giving some relief to middle-class and working Americans, and in fact, included in this tax bill was the child tax credit, but, more importantly, to extend and to help with poor children in terms of the refundability of a child credit that so many working families need.

This is an ugly bill from the perspective of increasing tax relief for those who do not need it, but I could not overlook the importance of helping our military families and particularly those men and women in combat to get the kind of relief on their earned income tax. We do it only for 2 years, unfortunately. The Democrats, we wanted more, 5 years.

But it is a start. Today we did not make tax cuts permanent. I hope we will not see another tax bill that does not treat working men and women more fair and the middle-class more fair and responds to the economic needs of this country. I do think, however, we needed more dollars for research, and this does so.

But it is ugly when we do not work together. This is an ugly tax bill, but it gives some relief to middle-class Americans.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SMART SECURITY AND ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water bravely stood up to the Bush White House by reducing, or flat out rejecting all of the administration's requests for nuclear weapons funding in its fiscal year 2005 appropriations bill. This subcommittee's move, under the sensible leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) is one of the only bipartisan instances of Members of Congress standing up to the heavy-handed Bush administration since this President took office in January of 2001.

The Subcommittee on Energy and Water wisely rejected White House requests of nearly $70 million for research and development of new nuclear weapons. Specifically, the White House requested $28 million for research on the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, otherwise known as the Bunker Buster; $30 million for planning a modern pit facility to produce new plutonium triggers; and $9 million for a new nuclear weapons initiative.

Moreover, the new energy and water appropriations bill in its current form would reduce the administration's request for the Cruise Missile warhead by $40 million and limit funds for all nuclear stockpile activities. In total, the subcommittee's changes would save American taxpayers over $150 million.

The gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) said the Bush administration's requests, quoting the chairman here, ''were technically questionable and frankly unnecessarily provocative in the international arena.'' He went on to say, ''They also cost a bunch of money.'' ''Unnecessarily provocative'' are the key words here.

Despite the unnecessarily provocative nature of these requests for new nuclear weapons, the Bush administration is trying to force the funding through anyway.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham outlined their concerns about the lack of funding for new nuclear weapons in a recent letter to the Republican House leadership in an attempt to dismiss entirely the tried and true appropriations process. Of course, they did not send this letter to the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman HOBSON) or his counterpart, Senator PETE DOMENICI, unless the letters got lost in the mail. To me, it seems like the Bush administration is up to its usual tricks.

Mr. Speaker, this White House has demonstrated nothing but callous disregard for the Congress and the congressional process. President Bush and his cohorts have given no pause when it comes to freezing out anyone who will not toe the line on their fiscally unsound, budget-busting spending plans.

When it comes to nuclear weapons in particular, President Bush just does not get it. Instead of investing in programs that will truly secure America, like nonproliferation initiatives and vigorous inspection regimes whenever possible, President Bush has spent America's money on more and bigger weapons, in an attempt, I believe, to be tough and also to avoid working with other nations.

Sometimes it seems like the Oval Office is run by a third grade bully. How many nuclear weapons can the United States possibly need? We already possess 9,000 strategic warheads. Do we really need to spend another $150 million to develop new weapons systems?

Mr. Speaker, there has to be a better way, because investing in new nuclear weapons does not prevent America from being attacked. In fact, it encourages a nuclear attack, because such investments incite our enemies and encourage other nations, like Iran, to develop nuclear weapons of their own.

That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, a Smart Security Platform For America's future. SMART

stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. Instead of a renewed buildup of nuclear weapons, SMART security calls for aggressive diplomacy, a commitment to nuclear nonproliferation, strong regional security arrangements and inspection regimes. Being smart about national security requires the United States to set an example for young democracies so that they can follow.

The U.S. must renounce first use of nuclear weapons and the development of new nuclear weapons. The Bush doctrine of arrogant nuclear proliferation has been tried and it has failed. Instead of engaging in a nuclear arms race for the 21st century, the United States must engage in a SMART security strategy for the 21st century.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCOTTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Constitution is the most unique and best contract ever drawn up between a people and their government throughout history. Though flawed from the beginning, because all men are flawed, it nevertheless has served us well and set an example for the entire world.

Yet no matter how hard the authors tried, the inevitable corrupting influence of power was not thwarted by the Constitution. The notion of separate States and local governments championed by the followers of Jefferson was challenged by the Hamiltonians almost immediately following ratification of the Constitution.

Early on the supporters of strong centralized government promoted central banking, easy credit, protectionism, mercantilism and subsidies for corporate interests.

Although the 19th century generally was kind to the intent of the constitution, namely limiting government power, a major setback occurred with the Civil War and the severe undermining of the principle of sovereign States.

□ 2000

The Civil War will finally change the balance of power in our federalist system, paving the way for centralized big government.

Although the basic principle underlying the constitutional republic we were given was compromised in the post Civil War period, it was not until the 20th century that steady and significant erosion of the Constitution restraints placed on the central government occurred. This erosion adversely affected not only economic and civil liberties but foreign affairs as well.

We now have persistent abuse of the Constitution by the executive, legislative and the judicial branches. Our legislative leaders in Washington demonstrate little concern for the rule of law, liberty and our republican form of government.

Today, the pragmatism of the politicians, as they spend more than $2 trillion annually, create legislative chaos. The vultures consume the carcass of liberty without remorse. On the contrary, we hear politicians brag incessantly about their ability to deliver benefits to their district, thus qualifying themselves for automatic reelection.

The real purpose of the Constitution was the preservation of liberty, but our government ignores this while spending endlessly, taxing and regulating. The complacent electorate who are led to believe their interests and needs are best served by a huge bureaucratic welfare state convince themselves that enormous Federal deficits and destructive inflation can be dealt with on another day.

The answer to the dilemma of unconstitutional government and runaway spending is simple: restore a burning conviction in the hearts and minds of the people that freedom works and government largesse is a fraud. When the people once again regain their confidence in the benefits of liberty and demand it from their elected leaders, Congress will act appropriately.

The response of honorable men and women who represent us should be simply to take their oaths of office seriously, vote accordingly and return our Nation to its proper republican origins. The result would be economic prosperity, greater personal liberty, honest money, abolition of the Internal Revenue Service and a world made more peaceful when we abandon the futile policy of building and policing an American empire. No longer would we yield our sovereignty to international organizations that act outside of the restraints placed on the government by the Constitution.

The Constitution and those who have sworn to uphold it are not perfect, and it is understandable that abuse occurs, but it should not be acceptable. Without meticulous adherence to the principle of the rule of law, minor infractions become commonplace, and the Constitution loses all meaning. Unfortunately, that is where we are today.

The nonsense that the Constitution is a living, flexible document taught as gospel in most public schools must be challenged. The Founders were astute enough to recognize the Constitution was not perfect and wisely permitted amendments to the document, but they correctly made the process tedious and difficult. Without a renewed love for liberty and confidence in its results, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to restore once again the rule of law under the Constitution.

I have heard throughout my life how each upcoming election is the most important election ever and how the very future of our country is at stake. Those fears have always been grossly overstated. The real question is not who will achieve the next partisan victory; the real question is whether or not we will once again accept the clear restraints placed in the power of the national government by the Constitution. Obviously, the jury is still out on this issue. However, what we choose to do about this constitutional crisis is the most important ''election'' of our times, and the results will determine the kind of society our children will inherit. I believe it is worthwhile for all of us to tirelessly pursue the preservation of the elegant constitution with which we have been so blessed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCOTTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PATENTS AND NANOTECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the current political debate on the economy is usually over the most recent economic statistics, but our economic future depends upon our remaining the most innovative economy in the world. The policies of this current administration and of this Congress are cheating Americans of our economic future, of the economic future that we deserve.

I rise tonight to speak specifically about the need for adequate funding for the United States Patent and Trademark Office and about the need to help get nanotechnology from the lab to the market.

Patents and trademarks are critical to the promotion and development of the American economy. In an increasingly competitive global market, it is essential that the administration and we in Congress do everything we can to maintain America's role as the leader in the creation of innovative technologies and of new products.

Innovation and competitiveness depend upon the effectiveness and efficiency of the United States Patent and